

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RONALD MEZA,  
Petitioner,  
v.  
CHRISTIAN PFEIFFER, Warden,  
Respondent.

No. 2:20-cv-2316 DAD CSK P

ORDER

On June 5, 2024, petitioner filed a motion for extension of time dated May 30, 2024, stating that he had not received a response from respondent, and asked that if respondent had filed a response or requested an extension of time, to please forward a copy of such requests to petitioner. (ECF No. 46 at 1.) In the meantime, petitioner asked that the Court “acknowledge this letter as a request for extension of time, until such time as a formal application can be drafted.” (Id.)

The record reflects that respondent filed a request to file a late response to petitioner’s motion to vacate the judgment, along with respondent’s response, which was filed and served on petitioner’s current address on May 30, 2024. (ECF No. 44.) It appears that respondent’s filing and petitioner’s June 5, 2024 motion crossed in the mail. Therefore, the Court will not order the Clerk to re-serve such documents on petitioner.

////

Moreover, on June 3, 2024, the Court granted respondent's request, and also granted petitioner an additional fourteen days in which to file his reply, if any. (ECF No. 45.) Thus, at present, petitioner's motion for extension of time is moot and is denied.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Petitioner's motion to have copies of respondent's filings (ECF No. 46) is denied;
2. Petitioner's motion for extension of time (ECF No. 46) is denied as moot; and
3. Petitioner's reply, if any, is due fourteen days from the June 3, 2024 order.

Dated: June 7, 2024

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
CHI SOO KIM  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

/l/meza2316.den